

REMARKS

Applicants gratefully note that the prior art rejections of claims 5 and 7-26 as obvious over U.S. Patent No. 7,173,724 to Nomura et al ("Nomura") when combined with Colbert '494 have been withdrawn in view of the amendments and arguments presented in the last response.

The Examiner, however, has given further review to the Nomura '724 reference, and concludes that it teaches the claimed features, and has rejected the pending claims under 35 USC 102(e). In particular, the Examiner cites Col. 10, lines 28-36 of Nomura discussing the situation where a printer display section 221 is operational and stops the display of information on the scanner 3. Regarding claim 10, he cites Col. 14, lines 19-30 of Nomura describing the printer user interface becoming inoperative when the scanner is connected to the printer.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 5 and 7-26 under 35 USC 102(e) as fully anticipated by Nomura '724.

First, Applicants submit herewith pursuant to 35 USC 119 and MPEP §201.15 certified translations of the two priority documents for the present application, JP2001-109200 filed April 6, 2001 and JP2001-142392 filed May 11, 2001, both prior to the U.S. filing date of Nomura '724 on December 20, 2001. Certified copies of the priority documents in Japanese were previously submitted, and their receipt acknowledged in the Office Action mailed on August 25, 2005. The subject matter of the priority documents supports the pending claims, and Applicants understand that these submitted translations overcome the rejection based on Nomura '724.

Second, Applicants have nevertheless amended the pending claims to cancel claims 5 and 7-9, amend claim 26, and add new claims 28-34.

The cancellation of Claim 5 and claims 7-9 dependent from claim 5, as well as the amendment of claim 26, are intended to avoid a possible confusion or

misunderstanding of the present invention. These amendments delete as a feature of the present invention that "in response to a command entered by one of the user interface sections, the other user interface section changes its display state to be in a non-display state." Rather, as stated in amended claim 26, (a) in a normal state, a first interface section is non-effective while a second interface section is effective, and (b) when the normal state switches to a specific processing set state in response to the second interface section entering a command to select a specific processing, the first interface section is made effective.

The amendment in claim 26 is supported by line 22 of page 37 to page 45, line 17. This passage also supports the new claims 28-34.

Applicants also note with respect to claim 19, while the Examiner interprets "invisible" as relating to a display in a non-display state, as used herein "invisible" refers to the problem solved by the present invention, possible operator confusion if two display interfaces can be visible and operable. Visibility or invisibility as used herein is not the same as display or non-display.

In view of the accompanying certified translations, the foregoing amendments, and the accompanying Remarks, Applicants believe that the claims define patentable differences over the art of record and that the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: May 5, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Peter J. Manus

Registration No.: 26,766

EDWARDS ANGELL PALMER & DODGE
LLP

P.O. Box 55874

Boston, Massachusetts 02205

(617) 517-5530

Attorneys/Agents For Applicant